



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,203	07/07/2003	Carl A. Caspers	55508-296762	8044
25764	7590	07/22/2005	EXAMINER	
FAEGRE & BENSON LLP PATENT DOCKETING 2200 WELLS FARGO CENTER MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			WILLSE, DAVID H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3738	

DATE MAILED: 07/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/615,203	CASPERS, CARL A.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Dave Willse	3738	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9-22-03.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Caspers, US 5,549,709. Figure 8 illustrates a compressible and expandable liner **60B** (column 8, lines 26-27) and a hypobarically controlled socket **52** (column 8, lines 15-50). The liner **60B** having an adhering interface which sealingly engages the inner wall of the socket **52** to minimize air leakage and to form a permanent attachment would have been immediately obvious, if not inherent, in order to facilitate the positive and negative pressures associated with positive pressure valve **104** and vacuum valves **106** and **110** and in view of the vacuum tube **76** (Figure 4) and other components being rather permanently affixed onto the remainder of the prosthesis (Figure 3). Regarding claims 2-4, official notice is taken that laminating adhesive, contact cement, and paint-on glue were well known to the ordinary practitioner and would have been obvious means for sealingly attaching the liner **60B** and socket **52**, with the ordinary practitioner having been left to select an appropriate material and having been motivated by the smooth abutting contact between respective surfaces of said liner and socket.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Sharp et al., US 2,533,404: Figures 1 and 3.

Claims 2, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharp et al., US 2,533,404. Substituting a laminating adhesive or a paint-on glue for the cement would have been an obvious choice of materials in order to find an optimal adhesive for use with materials selected for the liner and socket. Non-foamed, non-porous polyurethane would have been an obvious upgrade for the “rubber latex” (column 3, line 38) in view of the known advantages of the former material (e.g., flexibility, abrasion resistance, etc.), with Sharp et al. having been open to different materials for the adhesive (column 3, line 33) and the overlayer 33 (column 3, lines 37-38).

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

US 3,393,407: Figures 6 and 7; column 2, lines 31-34.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Willse whose telephone number is 571-272-4762. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott, can be reached on 571-272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Dave Willse
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3738